

Serial No. 09/453,772

**In the Claims:**

1. Please amend claim 1 as shown in the enclosed marked-up copy of amended claim 1;
2. Please amend claim 2 as shown in the enclosed marked-up copy of amended claim 2;  
and
3. Please leave claims 3-10 unchanged.

**In the Specification:**

1. Please amend the paragraph appearing on page 3 and extending from line 1 to line 20 as shown in the enclosed marked-up copy of the amended specification paragraph.

**Remarks:**

By this amendment, claim 1 has been amended to recite (1) that the cylindrical ring is provided "on outer peripheral edges of one of said planar yokes" rather than "on outer peripheral edges one of said planar yokes", and (2) that the detent torque is a "magnetic detent torque". Further, claim 2 has been amended to correct a grammatical error in which "an" was improperly used in place of "a". No new matter is added. Support for amendment (1) can be found in the specification on page 3, lines 8-10 and in the originally-filed claim 1; the error found in claim 1 appears to be the result of an inadvertent typographical error when submitting a previous amendment. Support for amendment (2) can be found throughout the application, as the torque described by the inventors is clearly magnetic torque (see, for example, page 11, lines 6-20). Also, a paragraph in the "Summary" section of the specification (page 3, lines 1-20) has been amended to match amendments made to claim 1.

By this amendment, it is believed that the claim objections set forth as to claims 1 and 2 in the Office Action are overcome.

Further, by this amendment, it is believed that the §103 obviousness rejection of independent claim 1 is overcome. In Applicant's previous response, Applicant asserted the patentability of claim 1 over the cited prior art combination of Komatsu, Atsumi, and Tojo because that combination fails to teach or suggest the use of detent torque as described in Applicant's invention. In response to these arguments, the Examiner now asserts that claim 1 remains obvious in view of the Komatsu/Atsumi/Tojo combination because Tojo, while teaching the elimination of magnetic detent torque, discloses the use of mechanical detent